



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,048	12/20/2001	Thomas Lee Adams	8285/470	5776
7590	06/29/2005		EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE SUITE 3600 455 N. CITYFRONT PLAZA DR. CHICAGO, IL 60611			PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,048	ADAMS, THOMAS LEE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/02 272262 VP</u>
<u>7/22/02 669</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The PTO-1449 sent on 3/26/2002 and 7/22/2002 are duplicates and hence only one is being considered and mailed.

Specification

The Specification is deficient of "Brief Summary of Invention" section. The Examiner cites MPEP 601[R-2], I, for the proposed requirement. Appropriate correction required.

Claim Objections

Claims 2-6, 8-13, 23-29, 31-32 objected to because of the following informalities: the claims begin with "The invention of Claim...", the Examiner believes it should be "The method of Claim...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 15-21 objected to because of the following informalities: the claims begin with "The invention of Claim...", the Examiner believes it should be "The system of Claim...". Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1, 7 and 22, is being objected to because the limitations begins "with a telephone network", "with the service control point", respectively for a method claim. The examiner suggests appending the term after the verb or adverb in the limitation, e.g. "routing a call with a telephone network..."

Claims 30 is being objected to because the limitations begins "with the telephone network", "with the server" for a method claim. The examiner suggests appending the term after the verb or adverb in the limitation, e.g. "routing a call with a telephone network..."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1-3, 14, 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,021,190 to Fuller et al(hereinafter Fuller).

Regarding Claim 1 and 30, Fuller discloses the routing a call from a calling party to a server, the calling party initiating the call from a calling line identified by a calling line identifier see Abstract & Col 1 Ln 63-67; the determining of authentication key and sending key to server and sending the key from the server to the calling party is met by Fuller see Col 2 Ln 19-44(Fuller discusses the forwarding of a number associated with a call line identifier and sending that information to PSTN).

Art Unit: 2132

Regarding Claim 2 and 3, Fuller discloses the call being routed through a service switching service and determining the key associated with the calling line identifier see Col 2 Ln 19-44.

Regarding Claim 14, Fuller discloses the server, a switch point operative to route calls, a database to correlating keys and identifiers, sending of keys thorough a server see Abstract & Col 1 Ln 63-67 & Col 2 Ln 19-44(Fuller discusses the forwarding of a number associated with a call line identifier and sending that information to PSTN).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4, 6, 12, 15-16, 18-24, 26-28, 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,021,190 to Fuller et al(hereinafter Fuller) in view of U.S. Patent 5901284 to Hamdy-Swink, Kathryn Anne.

Regarding Claim 4, 15 and 16, Fuller does not disclose the key being sent to a connectivity server through a key distribution server. However, Hamdy-Swink discloses

the passing of key to a connectivity server through a key distribution server see Col 18 Ln 31- Col 19 Ln 15. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the passing of key to a connectivity server through a key distribution server in the invention of Fuller in order to have another layer of security as taught in Hamdy-Swink see Col 18 Ln 31-36.

Regarding Claim 6, 12, 18, 28, 31, Fuller does not disclose the calling line identifier comprising a directory number. However, Hamdy-Swink discloses the calling line identifier comprising a directory number see Col 16 Ln 25-35. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the calling line identifier comprising a directory number in the invention of Fuller in order to have only authorized users using the system as taught in Hamdy-Swink see Col 16 Ln 29-33.

Regarding Claim 7 and 22, Fuller discloses the routing a call from a calling party to a server, the calling party initiating the call from a calling line identified by a calling line identifier see Abstract & Col 1 Ln 63-67; the routing thorough an service point see Col 2 Ln 19-44; the determining of authentication key and sending key to server and sending the key from the server to the calling party is met by Fuller see Col 2 Ln 19-44(Fuller discusses the forwarding of a number associated with a call line identifier and sending that information to PSTN). But Fuller does not discloses the use of key and connectivity servers. However, Hamdy-Swink discloses the passing of key to a connectivity server through a key distribution server see Col 18 Ln 31- Col 19 Ln 15. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the passing of

key to a connectivity server through a key distribution server in the invention of Fuller in order to have another layer of security as taught in Hamdy-Swink see Col 18 Ln 31-36.

Regarding Claim 8 and 21, 23 and 24, The removing authentication key from key distribution server and marking the key has distributed is obvious and one with ordinary skill in the art to make such a modification in order for there to be an updated list of keys official notice taken.

Regarding Claim 10, 20, 26, The communication between the connectivity sever and service switching point is via modem is disclosed by Fuller see Col 7 Ln 23-48.

Regarding Claim 13, 19, 29 The query being sent in response to terminating attempt trigger is disclosed by Fuller see Col 8 Ln 10-24.

Regarding Claim 27, Fuller discloses the consulting of database to see if the key(number) exists see Col 8 Ln 3-24.

Claim 5, 9, 17, 25, 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,021,190 to Fuller et al.(hereinafter Fuller) in view of U.S. Patent 5901284 to Hamdy-Swink, Kathryn Anne as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0049707 A1 to Tran.

Regarding Claim 5, 9, 17, 25, 32 Hamdy-Swink does not disclose the authentication key being sent to a key distribution server through a firewall. However, Tran discloses the sending of data with the key to a server thorough a firewall see Par. 0036. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include sending the key to a server through a firewall in the invention of Hamdy-Swink in order to provide another layer of protection as taught in Tran see Par. 0036.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor whose telephone number is 571-272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor

Application/Control Number: 10/038,048
Art Unit: 2132

Page 8

NP

6/17/2005

Examiner
Art Unit 2132


GILBERTO BARRÓN JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100